DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 140 FL 016 038

AUTHOR Guthrie, Larry F.
TITLE Contrasts in Teachers' Language Use in a Chinese-English Bilingual Classroom.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 83
GRANT NIE-G-81-0120
NOTE 15p.; In: Handscombe, Jean, Ed.; And Others. On TESOL '83. The Question of Control. Selected Papers from the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (17th, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983); see FL 015 035.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; *Cantonese; Chinese; *Classroom Communication; Comparative Analysis; *English (Second Language); Grade 1; *Language Usage; Limited English Speaking; *Monolingualism; Primary Education; Second Language Instruction; Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

A study examined the language use of two teachers, one a native, bilingual Cantonese-English speaker and the other a monolingual English-speaker, as they alternated teaching assignments between two first grade classes in a Chinese-English bilingual education program. Teacher-student interaction and the variation in teacher and student language use were observed and recorded. These data were coded using a modified system of conversational-acts (C-acts). The language was analyzed according to the utterances' grammatical structure, illocutionary properties, general semantic or propositional content, and for frequency and proportional usage. Results showed great consistency in the bilingual teacher's language use across groups, while the monolingual teacher's patterns of C-act use across language proficiency groups were quite different. Instructional organization and the use of the students' native language also varied between teachers relating to the different groups. The findings show that a monolingual teacher cannot act as effectively as the bilingual, for the monolingual is not familiar with language patterns that may cause confusion for second language learners. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275140

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

FRANK McERKIL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Contrasts in Teachers' Language Use In a Chinese-English Bilingual Classroom[1]

Larry F. Guthrie

LANGUAGE USE IN CLASSROOMS

In recent years, research on language use in classrooms has focused less on the strictly linguistic aspects of language than on the uses to which language is put and the functions it serves. How teachers and students *use* language may have more to do with the way children learn, and by the same token, the miscommunication, misunderstanding, and educational difficulty students encounter (Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972; Hymes, 1972, 1974; Guthrie & Hall, 1983; Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1981). Much of this work has concentrated on the differential treatment of students in lower proficiency groups (Good & Brophy, 1974; Cherry, 1978; McDermott, 1976; Rist, 1973).

In addition, if there is a discontinuity between the students' home language use and that required for success at school, then the opportunities for success for those students are reduced (Guthrie & Hall, 1983; Hall & Guthrie, 1982). Students of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, for example, act and use language according to the rules of their community and culture while at home; in the school, a different set of rules is operative. The degree to which interactions within that group are compatible with the students' native ways of communicating and organizing interactions should facilitate learning; the degree to which miscommunication is minimized should also contribute to student success.

FL016038

Larry F. Guthrie has taught ESL in the U.S., Africa and the Middle East. Since receiving his doctorate in Educational Psychology from the University of Illinois, he has worked on a major research project investigating aspects of bilingual education at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

[1]This work was completed pursuant to grant #NIE-G-81-0120. The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or endorsement of the Institute. Correspondence should be addressed to the author at Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Effective use of language by teachers with limited-English-speaking children (LES) has been the subject of considerable debate. Much of the discussion and research has focused on the relative amounts of English and the students' first language a teacher should use (e.g., Baker & deKanter, 1982; Legarretta-Marcaida, 1981; Milk, 1981). Some attention has also been given to comparisons of teachers' instruction and language use across different student groups. In a study of Hispanic Americans, Moll, Diaz, Estrada, & Lopes (in press) examined the language use of two teachers, only one of whom spoke Spanish, with the same group of children. They found that the teacher who did not speak the students' first language provided lessons at a lower level of difficulty than did the Spanish-speaking teacher. Apparently, the Anglo teacher underestimated the Spanish-speaking students' abilities because he himself did not speak Spanish. Mohatt and Erickson (1981) compared the cultural congruence of two teachers with their Native-American students, only one of whom was of the same culture as the students. Their conclusion was that the Native-American teacher and her students revealed a "shared sense of pacing" in their behavior that was at first absent in the other teacher's class (p. 112).

Previous research on language use in the classroom has focused on children from several different cultural and ethnolinguistic groups. These have included Hawaiians (Au, 1980; Boggs, 1972); Hebrew-speakers (Enright, Ramirez, & Jacobs, 1981-82); Hispanics (Carrasco, Vera & Cazden, 1981; Mehan, 1979; Moll, Diaz, Estrada, & Lopes, in press; Duran, 1981; Erickson, Cazden, Carrasco, & Guzman, 1979); and Native Americans (Mohatt & Erickson, 1981; Philips, 1972).

With the exception of the work by Fillmore (1981, 1982) and Pung Guthrie (1982, in press), language use of Chinese students and their teachers has been largely ignored. While considerable information is available on language use in monolingual classrooms, and to a lesser extent, on that in Hispanic bilingual situations, very little is known about how Chinese children and their teachers construct interactions. It is often assumed that because Asian-Americans have a reputation for high achievement, their children experience little educational difficulty. This attitude obscures the fact that large numbers of recent immigrants from Asia face serious problems in communicating and learning to speak and read English.

This study involved a detailed examination of the language use of two teachers of a group of Chinese-American first-graders (For a more complete account, see Guthrie, 1983). The students alternated each half-day between a Chinese bilingual teacher and a teacher who did not speak Chinese. The circumstances thus provided a rare opportunity to examine the language of two different teachers with the same LES children. The first of these teachers was bilingual and biliterate in English and Cantonese, and of the same cultural background as the students. She had immigrated to the U.S. at the age of nine, and both her Cantonese and English were native-like. I will call her Mrs. W. The second teacher was an anglo male who had taught in Spanish-English bilingual programs, but had little prior experience with Chinese students. I refer to him as Mr. M. Both were experienced teachers.

The basic question which directed the research sought an indepth description of the classroom interaction between Chinese-American children and their teachers. How do teachers orchestrate lessons and how, in turn, do students respond? What variation, in both teacher and student language, is found across instructional groups?

METHOD

Sociolinguistic methods were used to uncover the ways in which Cantonese-speaking children and their teachers constructed their interactions and used language. First, target students and speech events (lessons) were identified. Next, the naturally occurring speech in sample lessons was recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The procedures employed are described in more detail below. First, however, is a brief description of the setting in which the study was conducted.

Setting

The setting for the study was an elementary school with a predominantly Chinese population. The school was located near a large Chinatown community on the west coast.

There were approximately 644 students enrolled in Chinatown Elementary at the time of this study. The school population is relatively stable, but there are periodic influxes of new immigrant and refugee students from the Oriental Education Center where most new immigrants go first. Almost half the school population was Chinese; the remainder of the students were largely Spanish surname, other Oriental (primarily Vietnamese), and Black. Because of the ethnic quota system operative within the district, the school is now officially *closed* to new Chinese students, except those who live within the most immediate neighborhood. Most of the Chinese students at Chinese Elementary are classified as either limited-English-speaking (LES) or non-English-speaking (NES). These students, in turn, are placed in either a bilingual or regular class.

Subjects

Subjects were eleven first-grade Chinese-American students, selected on the basis of English language proficiency. Prior to data collection, each teacher was asked to rank all students in the class on a four-point scale of oral English language proficiency (Fuentes & Wisenbaker, 1979). The bilingual teacher also provided similar information on students' Chinese proficiency. These judgments were then verified through observations of potential target students. In this way, five students ranked at the low end of the scale (1-2), four ranked at the middle of the scale (3), and two fluent English speakers were selected.

Lessons

Two types of lessons were selected for analysis in this report, *reading in English* with the bilingual teacher and *oral language* in the anglo teacher's class. Although the lesson content and focus differed somewhat across the teachers' lessons, they were in many respects comparable. For two weeks prior to taping, classroom observers took descriptive fieldnotes and coded for activity structures (Bossert, 1978). These two lessons were found to be compatible in that they were both teacher-directed, student membership was approximately the same, and both teachers organized lessons around a basic question/answer format. Descriptions of the typical organization of each teacher's lesson follow.

Reading. Reading lessons were conducted in much the same way with each of the two groups. Mrs. W usually began by writing a list of vocabulary words on the board near the reading table. She then would introduce each word and ask students to read and say the words as a group. Individual students were then called on to read all the vocabulary words aloud. The next task for the reading lesson would involve using the student text or the accompanying story posters. Each poster contained a picture on the top and a story below. When she used the poster, the teacher would ask the students to look at the picture first, then describe it. Together, they would then read the story on the poster. When she used the book, she adopted the same approach as with the poster, beginning with a description of the picture, followed by reading. The final step in the typical reading lesson would be to ask the children to read the text silently, after which she asked them comprehension questions. To answer these, students were allowed to read an appropriate phrase or sentence from the text. Throughout the reading lesson, if students stumbled over a word, the teacher read it out and asked the student to repeat.

Oral Language. Mr. M divided his class for oral language into two instructional groups on the basis of oral English proficiency, low and a combination of middle and high. However, during the oral language period, only that group being taught by the teacher remained in the classroom; the other group met with another instructor in a different room. The overall procedures employed with each group were much the same.

The low group consisted of six students who sat in their assigned seats. For oral language, the teacher would join the group by pulling up an additional chair. Very often the lesson began with picture flash cards, which students were required to identify and describe.

The middle/high group was composed of nine students. They all sat at a table in the center of the room, where only the middle group students normally sat. The teacher brought his own chair when he joined the group. Once again, the teacher usually began with picture flash cards, which the students were to identify.

Data Collection

Audiotape recordings were made through the use of a Marantz recorder, with two lavaliere microphones placed in the middle of each group's table. Two data collectors were present during each taping session, both fluent speakers of Cantonese and English. One data collector took fieldnotes on the activities of the focal group, recording information on the physical arrangement of the group, important nonverbal behaviors, the text materials used, and other contextual information. The other data collector, meanwhile, monitored the audiotape through earphones and wrote down names and utterance fragments of speakers throughout the interaction to aid in subsequent transcription.

Transcription

The audiotape recording of each lesson was transcribed by the data collector who monitored that taping session. The handwritten transcript was then entered into an IBM Personal Computer used for the analysis. Those utterances in Chinese were transcribed in Chinese, and an English translation was provided in brackets. Descriptions of nonverbal behavior were included in parentheses.

Coding

Utterances were coded using a system of Conversational-acts (C-acts) developed by Dore (1977) and employed in several studies of children's language use (Cole, Dore, Hall & Dowley, 1978; Dore, Gearhart & Newman, 1978; Guthrie, 1981; Hall & Cole, 1978). C-acts represent a taxonomy of speech act types which code utterances according to (1) the grammatical structure of the utterance, (2) its illocutionary properties, and (3) its general semantic or propositional content.

Because of the different nature and focus of the present research, some modifications were made in the system as used in previous studies. These included both the addition and deletion of certain codes. The revised list of codes, definitions, and examples is presented in the Appendix.

Forty-nine separate speech acts, each assigned a three-letter code, comprise the Conversational-act system. These are grouped into six broad function types: (1) Assertions, which solicit information or actions; (2) Organizational Devices, which control personal contact and conversational flow; (3) Performatives, which accomplish acts by being said; (4) Requests, which solicit information or actions; and (5) Responses, which supply solicited information or acknowledge remarks (Dore et al., 1978,pp. 372-3). An additional category of special speech acts which codes microphone talk, laughing, singing, etc. is also included. Conversational-acts serving the Request function, for example, include Requests for Action (QAC), Product Requests (QPR), and Requests for Permission (QPM).

Coding proceeded as follows. First, the grammatical form and its literal semantic meaning were determined. Then a judgment was made as to the conventional force, or purpose, of the utterance. In this step, sequencing, reference, and other conversational cues, such as marked illocutionary devices and intonation, were taken into consideration. Utterances were thus placed first within the six broad function types, and then categorized as an individual Conversational-act. Throughout the coding, the contextual information contained in fieldnotes provided an additional check for the validity.

Initial coding was conducted by the data collector who observed a particular lesson. To ensure inter-coder agreement, each taped session was then coded a second time by another member of the research team, all of whom had engaged in two weeks of training and practice. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Throughout the coding process, inter-coder agreement for individual lessons ranged from .90 to .96. Although utterances in Chinese were translated into English and entered as data, all coding was done on the original Chinese.

Analyses

Out of a corpus of nearly six hours (340 minutes) of audiotape data, a total of 19 lessons/events were selected for analysis; Eleven reading lessons totaling 185 minutes, and eight oral language lessons totaling 155 minutes, were examined.

Each utterance within these lessons was coded according to four variables, (1) the speaker, (2) speaker's oral English proficiency, (3) language of the utterance, and (4) the Conversational-act (C-act) of the utterance. This resulted in a total of 15,753 coded utterances.

The frequency and proportion of C-acts performed by each speaker in each lesson were calculated, so that possible differences in the relative use of C-acts across

lessons and student proficiency groups were available. The results of these quantitative analyses are given in detail in the final report of the project (Guthrie, 1983). Briefly, the findings may be summarized as follows.

FINDINGS

The bilingual teacher was remarkably consistent in her use of language with the two groups of students. Despite certain variations, the distributions of C-acts were comparable overall. In the lessons taught by Mr. M on the other hand, the patterns of C-act use across language proficiency groups were quite distinct. With the higher group, the arrays of C-acts within lessons were similar to those found in Mrs. W's class. Interactions with the lower group, however, were characterized by a higher proportion of Attention Getters (OAG), Requests for Action (RAG), and Protests (PPR). Taken in combination, these Conversational-acts describe lessons in which there is a certain lack of control. What was not available in the reported proportions, however, was clear evidence for what these aspects of language use entail in practice. From the quantitative data, the effect of turn-taking mechanisms employed in the groups, for instance, could not be determined. To further examine this possibility, and explore the data for others, a detailed qualitative examination of the data was undertaken. This involved a careful reading of transcripts supplemented by occasional referral to the original tape.

Findings revealed important differences along the dimensions of instructional organization and the use of L1 in instruction. Because of space limitations, the first of these will be given only brief comment here (for a more complete treatment, see Guthrie, 1983). The remainder of the paper concentrates on the nature and importance of L1 use in instruction.

In short, at least two aspects of Mr. M's instructional organization were found to be contributing to the confusion in the lower group: the clarity of the instructions and rules for interaction. With the higher group, the task and interactional demands were made explicit. With those more limited in English proficiency, he was often vague about what students were to do and appeared to have no established system of distributing turns. His questions were cast out upon the table to be picked up by anyone.

Use of L1 in Instruction

Perhaps the most important source of difference between the two instructors was in the use of the children's first language. This is an area that has been widely studied and discussed (Duran, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Valdes-Fallis, 1977), but little attention has been given to the actual purposes to which teachers put L1. In this study, instances in the reading lessons in which Mrs. W employed L1 were examined in context. Possible reasons why she might have chosen to alternate language were then developed and discussed with the teacher.

Clearly, Mrs. W did not employ Chinese to any great degree in her reading lessons. The quantitative analysis revealed an average of less than seven percent over all such sampled lessons. This is in contrast to her language use in other lessons and throughout the day, when she frequently made use of the language. Research has shown, however, that code-switching or language alternation among bilinguals is seldom random and usually has a purpose, albeit unconscious. This appeared to be

the case with Mrs. W, for while she used Chinese very rarely in English reading lessons, when she did it was for a distinct reason. She told us later that she tried to avoid using Chinese during those lessons, and was somewhat surprised to find she had used L1 as much as she had. In retrospect, however, when examining the transcripts, the various purposes to which she put the language were quite obvious to her.

Mr. M, of course, never spoke Chinese with the students, but perhaps more telling was the fact that he often sanctioned students when they did. In many cases, what students said in Chinese was related to the lesson task. Unable to tell whether it was or not, however, Mr. M frequently shushed students he caught speaking Chinese, assuming they were not paying attention. In one lesson, for instance, the group was discussing the seal they had seen at the aquarium. One student said the seal was fat, and Mr. M agreed. But when another repeated that in Chinese, he quietened her.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (15:754–758)
Student 13	ADC	He too fat.
Mr. M	RAG	He's too fat.
	OBM	Now.
Student 12	ADC	*Hou feih.* (So fat.)
Mr. M	PPR	Sh-h-h!

The analysis of Mrs. W's use of Chinese revealed that she employed it for at least five distinct purposes: (1) for translation, (2) as a *we-code*, (3) for procedures and directions, (4) for clarification, and (5) to check for understanding. The first three of these were employed in several of the lessons, but not with the frequency of the final two, and will therefore only be briefly described. First, Mrs. W used Chinese to translate particular words which students appeared not to know or were obviously beyond the range of their vocabulary. Once, for example, she used the word "aisles," but provided the Chinese equivalent as well in order to maintain students' understanding. Second, she used Chinese as what Gumperz (1982) has termed a "we-code," a language which indicates group membership and personal connections. In one instance, for example, where the reading group was becoming disruptive, Mrs. W tried several times in English to get the students to behave. She finally pleaded in Chinese "don't be this way" thus appealing to them as an insider. Third, she occasionally gave procedures and directions in Chinese, e.g., to get students to use a key word in a complete sentence. The fourth and fifth uses of Chinese were to clarify and explain concepts presented in English and to check for student understanding. These final two will be treated in more detail.

Clarification. One of the new vocabulary words introduced to the middle and high groups was the word "lost." Mrs. W took care to make sure the groups understood what the word meant and in what ways it contrasted with the Chinese words for the same thing. In one lesson, two of the students appeared to confuse the transitive and intransitive uses of the English word and said, for example, "I lost one day" (18:332). In Chinese, this confusion is not possible, since there is a different lexical item for each meaning. Mrs. W paused at one point to help the group map these meanings onto the two forms in English.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (18:451-468)
Mrs. W	QPR	What does I lost my pencil mean?
Student 23	RPR	*Ngoh mhginjo ngohge bat.* (I don't see my pen.)
Mrs. W	RAG	Okay.
	OFS	Where does, uh . . .
Student 25	TRA	*Mhgin yuhnbat.* (Don't see pencil.)
Mrs. W	ADC	I was lost in the park.
	QCH	*Haih mhhaih mhginjo neih jinhgei a?* (Does it mean you don't see yourself?)
	QCHRPC	Does it mean that?
Student 23	RPC	*Ngoh mhginjo hai hai* park. (I can't be seen in the park.)
Mrs. W	AEX	*Mhginjo jikhaih dohng-sat-louh gam gaai.* (Can't be seen means got lost.)
	ORQ	Okay?
	AEX	*Mhhaih wah mhginjo.* (It doesn't mean don't see.)

Check for Understanding. Mrs. W also used Chinese to check for understanding. It appeared from the observations and the tapes that, at certain points, she sensed that one or more of the group did not quite understand. She thus switched to Cantonese or asked for a Cantonese equivalent from the students. In the following excerpt from a low group lesson, students were reading English vocabulary words off the board. Suddenly she stopped and asked in Cantonese for the meaning of "likes." Students' responses reveal they had confused "likes" with "lights." The teacher then attempted to clarify using English: "He likes the dog."

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (16:230-245)
Student 11	RVB	Little . . .
	RVB	Like . . .
	RVB	Likes . . .
Mrs. W	QPR	Likes *dim gaai a?* (What does "likes" mean?)
Student 11	RPR	*Dang.* (Light.)
Mrs. W	OCQ	*Ha?* (What?)
Student 13	RPR	*Hoi dang.* (Turn on lights.)
Student 11	RPR	*Dang.* (Lights.)
Mrs. W.	RAG	No. *Mhhaih.* (No.)
	AEX	It's not lights.
	QVB	Likes.
	ADC	He likes the dog.
Student 11	RPR	*Ngoc Jungyi.* (I like.)
Mrs. W	RAG	Okay.
	RAG	*Ngoc Jungyi.* (I like.)

This example points up an additional benefit of the teacher's facility with Cantonese. By using the students' first language, she was able to ferret out those areas of confusion and misunderstanding. By asking directly for the equivalent word in Cantonese, Mrs. W quickly and efficiently assessed how well the students understood. This strategy is not available to the monolingual English speaker. If a teacher not proficient in Cantonese sensed the same lack of understanding, he or she could of course ask the student to provide an English synonym or use the word in a sentence. For the limited English proficient student, however, these techniques would often be

ineffectual, particularly with students like Wilson (Student 11). As Mrs. W put it, he needed a lot of "language support;" he was uncomfortable using English and insecure about it. Had he therefore been asked to use "likes" or "lights" in a sentence, it is unlikely that he could have come up with *any* response in English, much less an appropriate one. His level of understanding would still have been a mystery.

DISCUSSION

This study considered in detail the interaction and language use of two teachers with a group of Chinese-American first-graders. In both the quantitative analysis of Conversational-act frequencies and proportions, and in the subsequent qualitative analysis, knowledge of the students' first language appeared to be critically important. The coding of C-acts was revealing in that it provided insights into overall patterns of language use in various lessons. It showed Mrs. W, for example, to be consistent in the distribution of C-acts she used with students having different levels of English language proficiency. The speech of Mr. M, on the other hand, who did not know Chinese, formed a quite different pattern with the limited English proficient students. C-acts having to do with sanctioning, attention-getting, and protesting occurred in higher frequency with the lower group, and together, appeared to indicate a lack of control.

The manner in which speakers put various C-acts together was examined through the qualitative analysis of transcripts and tapes. One focus was on the teachers' use of the students' L1. Mr. M, of course, spoke no Chinese and was thus unable to communicate with the children in their first and dominant language. An unfortunate outcome of this situation was that he often sanctioned the use of Chinese, since, as far as he could tell, the student speech was unrelated to lesson tasks. An examination of the transcripts revealed, however, that students sometimes answered in Chinese or gave brief explanations or hints to their classmates in that language.

Mrs. W made a conscious effort to use Chinese as little as possible during English reading; she used it much more in other lessons or in transitions. Chinese thus accounted for only a small portion of her speech in the reading lessons—less than seven percent. Nevertheless, the data show she carefully selected those occasions on which she did, and she employed Chinese for a variety of purposes, including translation, as a *we-code* for solidarity, and for procedures. Most frequently, however, she used the students' language to clarify or to check for understanding. Her use of the language revealed a sensitivity to the variable meanings in Chinese and English that made it possible for her to pick out likely sources of confusion. This is not to say, however, that she had conducted a contrastive analysis of the two languages. She simply recognized the points at which students might have difficulty; perhaps because she herself had learned English as a second language.

This was something Mr. M could not do. Even when students were obviously confused, he was often unable to get at the root of the problem because of the language barrier. Many times the confusion arose because students in the lower group had difficulty making themselves understood, and lacked the English skills necessary to rephrase their statements. Clearly, then, had Mr. M been able to better communicate with the LEP students, he might have avoided the frequent loss of student attention.

The data from Mr. M's class serve to point up just how difficult teaching non- and limited-English-speaking children can be for teachers who do not speak their students' first language. The task of communicating with them becomes formidable indeed. This fact has serious implications for staffing in bilingual programs. Good arguments can be made for employing an alternate-day (or half-day) model, e.g., students are exposed to native speakers of both languages. However, in cases like that of this study, where students speak very little English, a single bilingual teacher might have an advantage. This is not to say, of course, that monolingual teachers might not also be effective with NES/LES students. Some of the features of Mrs. W's teaching, for example do not require a high level of *proficiency* in the students' L1. A monolingual teacher who has some *knowledge* of how the students' L1 operates and an appreciation that the students may be using the L1 on task, could employ some helpful strategies. Use of the students' L1 simply stands as another valuable resource available to the bilingual teacher.

Some monolingual teachers have been known to delegate the instruction of NES/LES students to a bilingual instructional aide (Fillmore, 1982; Pung Guthrie, in press) but unless the aide is fully bilingual, and a competent instructor besides, this would not appear to be an improved solution. The effective use of L1, even in English reading lessons, requires more than just a working knowledge of the language. To be able to identify points of possible confusion and clarify them as Mrs. W did, a teacher must be highly proficient in both Cantonese and English. Therefore, in staffing primary grade classes with limited- and non-English speaking children, serious consideration should be given to the overall bilingual proficiency of the teacher.

REFERENCES

Au, Kathryn H. Participant structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 1980, *11*, 91-115.

Baker, Keith & Adriana deKanter. *Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of the literature*. Final draft report, Office of Technical and Analytic Systems, Office of Planning and Budget, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Boggs, Steven T. The meaning of questions and narratives to Hawaiian children. In C.B. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Bossert, Steve. *Tasks and social relationships in classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Carrasco, Robert, Alturo Vera & Courtney Cazden. Aspects of bilingual students' communicative competence in the classroom: A case study, In R. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Cazden, Courtney, Vera John, & Dell Hymes. *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Cherry, Louise. A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Study of Teacher Expectations. *Discourse Processes*, 19/8, *1*, 373-393.

Cole, Michael, John Dore, William Hall, & Gillian Dowley. Situation and task in children's talk. *Discourse Processes*, 1978, *1*, 119-176.

Dore, John. Children's illocutionary acts. In R. Freedle (Ed.), *Discourse production and comprehension* (Vol. 1). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1977.

Dore, John, Meryl Gearhart, & Denny Newman. The structure of nursery school conversation. In K. Nelson (Ed.), *Child Language* (Vol. 1). New York: Gardner Press, 1978.

Duran, Richard. (Ed.) *Latino language and communicative behavior*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1981.

Enright, D. Scott, A. Ramirez, & J. Jacobs. Language use in an English/Hebrew bilingual preschool classroom. *NABE Journal*, 1981-82, 6, 69-88.

Erickson, Frederick, Courtney Cazden, Robert Carrasco, & R. Guzman. Social and cultural organization of interaction in classrooms of bilingual children. Midquarter report submitted to the National Institute of Education, NIE G-78-0099, 1978-1981.

Erickson, Frederick & Jeffrey Schultz. When is a context?: Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings*, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Fillmore, Lily Wong. Thoughts on non-English speaking children. In *Bilingual education: Current perspectives. Synthesis* (Vol. 4). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Fillmore, Lily Wong. Instructional language as linguistic input: Second-language learning in classrooms. In L. Cherry Wilkinson (Ed.) *Communicating in the Classroom*. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Fuentes, Edward J. & J.M. Wisenbaker. The use of teacher rating of oral English proficiency as a covariate in the analysis of reading scores. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, 1979.

Good, Thomas L. & Jere E. Brophy. *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Green, Judith L. & Cynthia Wallat. *Ethnography and language in educational settings*, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporations, 1981.

Gumperz, John J. Conversational inference and classroom learning. In J.L. Green & C. Wallat, *Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings*, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Guthrie, Larry F. *Learning to use a new language: Language functions and use by first grade Chinese-Americans*. (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0120). National Institute of Education: Washington, D.C., 1983.

Guthrie, Larry F. & William S. Hall. Language continuity/discontinuity and schooling. In E. Gordon (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. X). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1982.

Guthrie, Larry F. The task variable in children's language use: Cultural and situational differences. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois, 1981.

Guthrie, Larry F. & William S. Hall. Ethnographic approaches to reading research. In P.D. Peason (Ed.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, New York: Longmans, in press.

Hall, William S., & Michael Cole. On participant's shaping of discourse through their understanding of the task. In K. Nelson (Ed.) *Children's Language* (Vol. 1). New York: Gardner Press, 1978.

Hall, William S., & Guthrie, Larry F. Cultural and situational variation in language function and use: Methods and procedures for research. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in education settings*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Hymes, Dell. Introduction. In C.B. Cazden, V.P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Hymes, Dell. *Foundations in sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

Legarreta-Marcaida, Dorothy. Effective use of the primary language in the classroom. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 1981.

McDermott, Raymond P., *Kids make sense*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, 1976.

Mehan, Hugh. *Learning Lessons*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Milk, Robert. An analysis of the functional allocation of Spanish and English in a bilingual classroom. *CABE Research Journal*, 1981, *2*, 11-26.

Mohatt, Gerald & Frederick Erickson. Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa School: A sociolinguistic approach: In H.T. Trueba, G.P. Guthrie, & K.H. Au (Eds). *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1981.

Moll, Louise, E. Diaz, E. Estrada, & L. Lopez. Making contexts: The social construction of lessons in two languages. In M. Saravia-Shore & S. Arvizu (Eds.), *Cross-cultural and communicative competencies: Ethnographies of educational programs for language minority students*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Anthropology and Education, in press.

Philips, Susan. Participant structures and communicative competence. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Pung Guthrie, Grace. An ethnography of bilingual education in a Chinese community. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1982.

Pung Guthrie, Grace. *An ethnography of bilingual education in a Chinese community*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, in press.

Rist, Ray. *The urban school: A factory for failure*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973.

Tikunoff, William. An emerging description of successful bilingual instruction: An executive summary of Part I of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983.

APPENDIX

Codes, Definitions, and Examples of Conversational-Acts

Code	Definition and Examples
Assertives report facts, state rules, convey attitudes, etc.	
AAT	*Attributions* report beliefs about another's internal state: "He does not know the answer."; "He wants to."; "He can't do it."
ADC	*Descriptions* predicate events, properties, locations, etc. of objects or people: "The car is red."; "It fell on the floor."; "We did it."; "We have a boat."
AEV	*Evaluations* express personal judgments or attitudes: "That's good."
AEX	*Explanations* state reasons, causes, justifications, and predictions: "I did it because it's fun."; "It won't stay up there."
AID	*Identifications* label objects events, people, etc.: "That's a car."; "I'm Robin."
AIR	*Internal Reports* express emotions, sensations, intents, and other mental events: "I like it."; "It hurts."; "I'll do it."; "I know."
APR	*Predictives* states expectations about future events, actions, etc.: "I'll give it to you tomorrow."; "It'll arrive later this week."
ARU	*Rules* state procedures, definitions, "social rules," etc.: It goes in here."; "We don't fight in school."; "That happens later."
Organizational Devices control personal contact and conversational flow.	
OAC	*Accompaniments* maintain contact by supplying information redundant with respect to some contextual feature: "Here you are"; "There you go."
OAG	*Attention Getters* solicit attention: "Hey!"; "John!"; "Look!"
OBM	*Boundary Markers* indicate openings, closings, and shifts in the conversation "Okay"; "All right"; "By the way."

OCQ *Clarification Questions* seek clarification of prior remark: "What?"
OEX *Exclamations* express surprise, delight, or other attitudes: "Oh!"; "Wow!"
OFL *Fillers* enables a speaker to maintain a turn: ". . . well . . ."; ". . . and uh . . ."
OFS *False Starts* indicate aborted utterances: "We . . . they"
OPM *Politeness Markers* indicate ostensible politeness: "Please"; "Thank you."
ORQ *Rhetorical Questions* seek acknowledgement to continue: "Know what?"
OSS *Speaker Selections* label speaker of next turn: "John"; "You."
OVP *Verbal Play* indicate language in which meaning is secondary to play.

Performatives accomplish acts (and establish facts) by being said.
PBT *Bets* express conviction about a future event: "I bet you can't do it."
PCL *Claims* establish rights for speaker: "That's mine"; "I'm first."
PJO *Jokes* cause humorous effect by stating incongrous information, usually patently false: "We throwed the soup in the ceiling."
PPR *Protests* express objections to hearer's behavior: "Stop!"; "No!"
PTE *Teases* annoy, taunt, or playfully provoke a hearer: "You can't get me."
PWA *Warnings* alert hearer of impending harm: "Watch out!"; "Be careful!"

Requestives solicit information or actions.
QAC *Action Requests* seek the performance of an action by hearer: "Give me it!"; "Put the toy down!"
QCH *Choice Questions* seek either-or judgments relative to propositions: "Is this an apple?"; "Is it red or green?"; "Okay?"; "Right?"
QMA *Requests for Mental Action* seek specific mental activity by the hearer: "Think"; "Remember."
QPC *Process Questions* Seek extended descriptions or explanations: "Why did he go?" "How did it happen?"; "What about him?"
QPM *Permission Requests* seek permission to perform action: "May I go?"
QPR *Product Questions* seek information relative to most "WH" interrogatives" "Where's John?"; "What happened?"; "Who?" "When?"
QSU *Suggestions* recommend the performance of an action by hearer or speaker or both: "Let's do it!"; "Why don't you do it?"; "You should do it."
QVB *Verbal Action Requests* seek performance part of an instructional routine such as reading aloud, conducting language-learning exercises, repeating, or spelling: "Read this word"; "Repeat after me"; "I go, you go, he . . ."

Responsives supply solicited information or acknowledge remarks.
RAG *Agreements* agree or disagree with prior non-requestive act: "No, it is not!"; "I don't think you're right."
RAK *Acknowledgements* recognize prior non-requestives and are non-commital: "Oh"; "Yeah."
RCH *Choice Answers* provide solicited judgments of propositions: "Yes."
RCL *Clarification Responses* provide solicited confirmations: "I said no."
RCO *Compliances* express acceptance, denial, or acknowledgement of requests: "Okay"; "Yes"; "I'll do it."
RPC *Process Answers* provide solicited explanations: "I wanted to."
RPR *Product Answers* provide Wh-information: "John's here"; "It fell."
RQL *Qualifications* provide unsolicited information to requestives: "But I didn't do it"; "This is not an apple."
RVB *Response to Requests for Verbal Action* provides solicited speech, such as reading aloud, repeating in chorus, or spelling.

- *Special Speech Acts* are prescribed utterances expressed in a special way.
  - SAC *Counting* indicates naming numerals or counting objects.
  - SAL *Laughing* codes laughter.
  - SAS *Singing* indicates singing, either words or sounds.
  - MKE *Microphone talk* codes speech directed at the tape recorder microphone, often silly or nonsensical.
  - NVB *Nonverbals* code important nonverbal acts.
  - TRA *Translation* codes conscious, direct translations.
  - UNT *Uninterpretables* indicate uncodable utterances.